

Interview Summary	Application No. 08/078,768	Applicant(s) TULLIS, RICHARD H.	
	Examiner James Martinell	Art Unit 1631	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) James Martinell.

(3) Mr. Boswell.

(2) Mr. Caldwell.

(4) Mr. Handley.

Date of Interview: 31 July 2002.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: All.

Identification of prior art discussed: None.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants urged that undue experimentation would not have been necessary to practice the claimed invention and pointed to Crooke declaration filed 6/21/02. Discussion centered on time at which in vivo antisense protein downregulation was first demonstrated. Issue is whether it would have taken undue experimentation for one of skill in the art to practice antisense downregulation of protein synthesis in vivo or whether success would have been merely tedious and possibly expensive. Exr. will consider any post-filing date references or other evidence that applicant may provide for the record..

BEST AVAILABLE COPY